

**Serial No. 09/574,987; Navy Case No. 82408**

identified application.

In the above-cited Office Action, claims 7-13, 27-35 and 37 are pending. All of these claims have been rejected. Claims 34, 35 and 37 have been cancelled. Claims 7-13, 27-33 remain in the application.

**Patent Office Rejection of Claims 7-13, 27-35 and 37 under 35 USC 112**

The Examiner states that the rejected claims are indefinite under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner indicates that Claims 7, 34 and 37 are indefinite due to the improper use of the word "disposed". The Examiner indicates that the word "disposed" is defined in the *American Heritage Dictionary* as "arranged in a particular order". The Examiner asserts that there appears to be no particular order required by the specification.

**Applicant's Response to 35 USC 112 Rejection**

On 21 July 2003, Applicant's Attorney Mr. Peter Lipovsky and Examiner Tran discussed the use of the word "disposed". It was agreed that the section 112 rejection of the term would be withdrawn. Mr. Lipovsky has received the Examiner's Interview memorandum describing the agreement and expresses gratitude to the Examiner for concluding this matter. This section 112 rejection should not be overcome.

**Patent Office Rejection of Claim 34 under 35 USC 102(b) based upon Amatore or Hoffman**

In the Office Action of 22 April 2003, this rejection has been withdrawn.

**Patent Office Rejection of Claims 34 and 37 under 35 USC 102(b) based upon Hargreaves**

Claims 34 and 37 are rejected based upon Hargreaves.

**Serial No. 09/574,987; Navy Case No. 82408**

**Applicants' Response to the Patent Office Rejections of Claims 34 and 37 under 35 USC  
102 based upon Hargreaves**

Applicant has cancelled claims 34 and 37. The rejection of these claims is now moot.

**Patent Office Rejection of Claim 35 under 35 USC 103(a) based upon Amatore or Hoffman,  
in combination with Zirino**

In the Office Action of 22 April 2003, this rejection has been withdrawn.

**Patent Office Rejection of Claim 35 under 35 USC 103(a) based upon Hargreaves as  
applied to claim 34 above, and further in view of Zirino.**

Claim 35 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) based upon Hargreaves as applied to claim 34 above, and further in view of Zirino.

**Applicants' Response to the Patent Office Rejection of claim 35 based upon Hargreaves as  
applied to claim 34 above, and further in view of Zirino.**

Applicant has cancelled claim 35. The rejection of these claims is now moot.

**Serial No. 09/574,987; Navy Case No. 82408**

Any inquiry concerning this case should be directed to Applicant's attorney, Mr. Peter Lipovsky at (619) 553-3824.

Respectfully submitted,

by

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Peter A. Lipovsky". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

PETER A. LIPOVSKY  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 32,580

29 July 2003  
Commanding Officer  
Legal Counsel for Patents, Code 20012  
Attention: Peter A. Lipovsky  
SPAWARSYSCEN SAN DIEGO  
53510 Silvergate Ave Rm 103  
San Diego, CA 92152-5765  
(619) 553-3824